



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Brauo y mortal omicero,
 Como buytre carnicero,
 Que á todos a destroçado.
 Siempre fueron muy feroçes
 Los de donde este deçiede.
 Mira, mira, assi te goçes,
 Como assi segura con hoçes
 A quien algo mal les riende.

So that it is evident that Arredondo not only wrote poetry (?), but that he made use of the metrical form found in the poem under consideration.

The results of this investigation may be briefly summarized as follows: 1. The title of the poem in *quintillas* is not "Crónica de los Rimos Antiguos." 2. It was not composed in the middle of the fourteenth century, but is contemporary with the prose chronicle in which it is found. 3. The author was probably Arredondo himself. 4. The title "Crónica de los Rimos Antiguos" is used by Arredondo to refer to the thirteenth century *Poema de Fernan Gonzalez*.

C. CARROLL MARDEN.

Johns Hopkins University.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE SKEIREINS.

THE authorship of the Skeireins will probably never be definitely determined. Loebe, one of the earliest authorities on this question, arrived at the conclusion that,

"Whoever the author of the Skeireins may be, the question is so difficult to answer, and connecting links are so entirely wanting, that it seems better to leave the question alone."

Certain features of the language, however, are worthy of attention.

Marold, after a minute investigation, concludes that the text of the citations is that of Wulfila throughout. This he infers in the case of those passages not preserved in the Codex Argenteus, from the close adherence to the Greek text and from the idiom. But, he concludes, the text quoted is one more interpolated than the Codex Argenteus. The time of composition he determines to be not earlier than the middle of the fifth century, probably sometime in the sixth century.

But it is with the commentary or Skeireins proper, that we are more directly concerned. Bernhardt in his edition summarizes the results

of investigation up to the time of that edition, and concludes that the Skeireins is not translated, but composed in the Gothic language, with the aid, however, of Greek commentaries. He cites correspondences in thought and in individual expressions, discovered by Massmann and others, between certain passages in the Skeireins and corresponding passages in Cyrillus and Theodorus, and concludes that the author of the Skeireins had before him either these works or some common work upon which these two were based. But that the Skeireins is not a translation, at least not a slavish one like that of Wulfila, Bernhardt concludes from the nature of the language and the manner of exposition. As illustration of independence he cites a number of Gothic idioms which, he asserts, cannot be shown either in Greek or in Latin: *und pana laist II d, V a, ni þe haldis IV d, in allaim alamannam VIII b*, and points out the awkward accumulation of participles, for instance, *IV b, VIII c*; and of genitives, for instance, *III b, c*; and the frequent anacolutha, for instance, *IV a, V c*.

What I have here to offer is further internal evidence in line with that presented by Bernhardt.

In the first place a statistical study of the word-order shows that the Skeireins, as a whole, is not a translation from the Greek. This conclusion I have reached after a comparison of statistics for the Skeireins proper, with corresponding statistics for the cited passages, which, as Marold has shown, are from Wulfila, and with statistics gathered by Friedrichs for clauses with pronominal subject, in Wulfila. These statistics are as follows:

1. Clauses with pronominal subject, in Wulfila.

	NORM.	PART.	TRANSP.	TRANSP.
<i>Principal.</i>	115	25		55
<i>Subordinate.</i>	60	15		30

2. Cited passages in the Skeireins.

	NORM.	PART.	TRANSP.	TRANSP.
<i>Principal.</i>	19	3		10
<i>Subordinate.</i>	24	0		5

3. Skeireins proper.

	NORM.	PART.	TRANSP.	TRANSP.
<i>Principal.</i>	12	11		39
<i>Subordinate.</i>	16	16		23

If we make allowance for the fact that Friedrichs, in his statistics for Wulfila, includes only clauses with pronominal subjects, we see that the order of words in the citations of the Skeireins, as regards transposition, is very similar to that in Wulfila, but that the order of words of the Skeireins proper is very different. In these facts we find a corroboration of Marold's conclusion that the citations in the Skeireins are from Wulfila. We find also strong indication, not to say proof, that the Skeireins was not a translation from the Greek. Hence any lingering idea that the whole Skeireins is a translation from Theodorus, or from Cyrillus, is effectually dispelled.

That the author of the Skeireins was unacquainted with Greek is not so certain. On the contrary, it seems certain that he was influenced by Greek idiom in places, and that in the composition of the Skeireins he had before him Greek works. For evidence note the correspondences, quoted by Bernhardt, between passages in the Skeireins and passages in Theodorus and Cyrillus. For further internal evidence note the following phrases; *þo faura ju us anastodeinai garaidon garehsn* I c; *þana iupa briggandan in þiudangardjai guþs wig* II a, constructed like phrases in Wulfila which are due to Greek influence; for instance, *bi þos gafalloweisidons in uns waihtins* = *περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων*, Luke i, 1; *bi þaim faurasniwandam ana þuk þraufetjam* = *κατὰ τὰς προαγούσας ἐπὶ σε προφητείας*, I. Tim. i, 18.

There are a number of other idioms probably due to Classical influence. For instance the peculiar fondness for the suppression of predication through the use of participles may, perhaps, be attributed to Classical influence, though the author of the Skeireins uses this construction to an extent not permissible either in Greek or in Latin. Further, the general freedom in the arrangement of words so that the important word has the position of emphasis either at the beginning or at the end, is a feature common to the Skeireins and to the Classical languages; for instance, *Naudi-paurfts auk was* . . . II c, *ei swesamma wiljin jah swesai mahtai galeikonds þamma faurþis gaqinujandin dauþaus* V b. Under this head may be included the frequent inversions; for

instance, *miþ sis misso sik andrunnun sumai* III a, and possibly, not probably, the favorite position of the governing word, noun or verb, at the end.

But the feature to which I wish particularly to call attention is a peculiar one which I believe to be Classical, more probably Latin than Greek. This feature is the so frequent rhetorical separation of words (usually noun and adjective) that are connected in meaning. I will cite the instances that I have observed: *uf dauþaus adrusum staua*, I a; *gamains allaize nasjands*, I a; *þizos manasedais gawaurhtedi uslunein*, I a; *waldufnja þatainei gudiskamma*, I b; *þo leikeinon us wambai munands gabaurþ*, II b; *twos ganamnida waihtins*, II d; *ainhwaparammeh seina anafilhandam dauþein*, III a; *leikis hraineino inmaidips was sidus*, III b; *þo ahmeinson anafilhands dauþein*, III b; *skeiris brukjands waurdis*, V b; *attins bi ina warþ weitwodeins*, VI c; *missaleikaim bandwiþs mannam*, V c; *iþ attins þairh meina waurstwa weitwodei alla ufar insaht manniskodans Johannes unandsok izwis undredan mag kunþi*, VI b; *þaim swa waurþanam hairdizo þize ungalaubjandane wairþ hairto*, VI c; *weihai auk is mahtai*, VIII a.

This phenomenon of word-order, so characteristic of the Skeireins, is not, to my knowledge, frequent in any independent composition in the Teutonic languages. It is, however, to be found both in Greek and in Latin, for instance, *ἐἰ τις ἀδελφὸς γυναικα ἔχει ἀπίστον*, I. Cor. vii, 12; *Ἰσοκράτους ὦν μαθητὴς*, Diod. Sic.; *ἐδ κίνδυνον ἦκαν ἐν μεγίστῳ*, Herod.; *ego vobis regnum trado firmum*, Sallust; *hac utar moderatione*, Cicero; *Tanta in eo rei-publicae bene gerendae spes*, Cicero; *maiore affici turpitudine videremus*, Cicero. I might multiply instances both from Latin and from Greek. The phenomenon seems to be more peculiarly Latin; at least I have found it more frequent in Latin. Note also in Latin the familiar separation of noun and adjective by means of the preposition; for instance, *quibus in locis paucis ante diebus*, Cicero. In any event we have here a trace of an influence, certainly of the Classical languages, probably of Latin.

Since, then, the author of the Skeireins in places uses Gothic idiom, in other places idiom

peculiar to the Classical languages, we must agree with Bernhardt that the work as a whole is an independent composition, but that the author has borrowed, ideas probably, constructions certainly, from the Classical languages. In other words, the work is probably composite. In this paper, in addition to what was already known, I have attempted to present further reasons, from internal evidence, for believing that the Skeireins is not a word-for-word translation of a Greek original and, at the same time, to show that there are unmistakable traces of Classical, certainly of Greek, probably of Latin, influence.

GEORGE H. MCKNIGHT.

Cornell University.

LE PAS SALADIN.

III.

THE following is not an exhaustive study of the language of the text, all characteristics not essential to the determination of dialect having been omitted. In referring to the dialect spoken in central France, the shorter word "French" is almost always used in place of "Isle-de-France."

VOWELS.

A.

Latin tonic *a* in open syllable and before oral consonants becomes *e* and *ei*.

Examples:—1, recorder; 38, sermoner; 56, reposer; 72, loyaute; 90, assembler; 100, bonte; 106, conte; 113, tref; 126, grever; 127, mer; 128, entree; 147, aler; 202, mandes; 17, livreis; 101, aleir; 144, conteit; 175, larmeir; 270, esporonneit; 287, meir; 302, fermeis; 303, chiteis; 340, leis.

This development to *ei* is of some importance as it occurs so regularly throughout the text. The rhymes *bonte: aleir*, 100; *vorres: larmeir*, 175, as well as in lines 276, 314, and 384, prove that there was no difference in the pronunciation of *e* and *ei*, which must have been *e*. The writing of *ei* for Latin *a* belongs especially to the East, and its presence in Picardy, where it is found only in the eastern half, is probably due to the influence of the Wallonian (*Lor. Ps.* viii; *Rom. Stud.* iv, 360; *Neu.* 18).

Alicum becomes *age*.

Examples:—125, 135, 328, 441, 536, 553, 594, passages; 420, domage; 591, barnages; 595, lignage.

Aige, a special eastern characteristic, is frequently found in Wallonian, and more rarely in Picardy. In French, it is always *age* (*Chev.*, xxxiii; *Neu.*, 12; *Rom.* xvii, 555).

Atr becomes *er*.

Examples:—32, pere; 111, mere.

This is the regular French characteristic, while the eastern *eir*, or *air* does not occur (*Rom.* xvii, 554).

After a palatal, or palatalized consonant, *a* becomes *ie*, *e*.

Examples:—12, croisier; 56, aisier; 117, prisier; 125, 141, gaitier; 147, laisies; 176, pitier; 104, 453, cher.

The group *ie* was originally pronounced as a diphthong with the accent on the *i* (*Rom.* vi, 322). Later it was written and pronounced *e*. Schwan, 289, says that the diphthong *ie* was reduced to *e* at the end of the thirteenth century, and that the first examples are found after *ch*, as *cher* for *chier*. In the east of France, the reduction did not take place before the middle of the thirteenth century, and it rarely occurred in Picardy. Except in the Norman dialect, which lies outside of the present discussion, the change seems to have been a late one, and the fact that the rhymes *ie: e* occur quite frequently in the text, would indicate that the MS. could not have been written much before the close of the thirteenth century. In lines 107 and 515, *ie* is pronounced *e* in *pite*, a word which has retained the diphthong to the present day.

a+n becomes *an*.

Examples:—8, remembrance; 42, demorance; 84, lechans; 85, 118, soudans; 130, derubans; 218, avant; 219, devant.

The nasalized *a* is of little importance in the present investigation, for since the twelfth century, both *ā* and *ē* were pronounced alike in most of the northeastern dialects as well as in French (*Sch.*, 298). They are found rhyming together in line 7; namely, *countenance: remembrance*, but elsewhere in the text they are generally kept separated.

The development of *ain* and *ein* is similar to the above. They rhyme together in the twelfth century, and both rhyme with *oin* in